



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

the layman, in receiving any sacrament, or in performing any other act of worship, to receive in the faith of Christ's promises—to worship in spirit and in truth. Neither clergyman nor layman can do otherwise, without a mockery of God—without great and grievous sin. But the sin of the ministering clergy cannot make void the promises of Christ, nor invalidate the sacrament, any more than the sin of the layman, who worships in outward act only, can make void the promise, or invalidate the sacrament. "Yea, let God be true," says the Apostle, "but every man a liar." Faith in the recipient of a sacrament is necessary on his part, and without it his receiving is a sin, enhancing his condemnation; not conferring grace. But the unbelief or the wrong intention of the ministrant cannot deprive the faithful recipient of the benefits of the sacrament, without making void the promises of God. This is what we say and maintain. To minister without intending what Christ intended, or with the intention of anything else, is an act of profanity—of grievous sin on the part of the minister; but this sin does not annul the promises of Christ made to the faithful in the sacrament; because the wickedness of man, however gross, cannot make void the word and promises of Christ. Your doctrine cannot, by any ingenuity of sophistry, be made to follow from this.

R. But where is the great harm of our doctrine? and what are those pernicious consequences which you say must follow from it? To me it appears most useful and salutary, as impressing upon the minds of the clergy the necessity of looking well to their intention and mental devotion in the solemn act of ministration, and so guarding them against what you acknowledge would be in them a grievous sin and profanation.

A. But we must not seek to impress the mind even against sin by the pretence of consequences that are not true. It is not true that defect of intention, or any other sin, not even want of faith, in the ministrant, will hinder the effects of the sacrament, or make void the promises of Christ. Therefore, we cannot consent to teach what is untrue, even though it were demonstrated that it might be occasionally useful, and that a man might be thereby sometimes deterred from a sinful act. It should be enough for the clergy to know that to minister the sacraments with a lip service only is a sin, just as ministering without faith is a sin, and yet your divines admit that want of faith does not invalidate the sacraments; but, might it not be as fairly said, that to teach the contrary would be useful and salutary, inasmuch as if the clergy were made to believe that the sacraments would be null, without faith in the ministrant, they would be the more impressed with the necessity of ministering with faith?

R. You mistake me. I do not say that this incidental good effect is a reason for teaching the doctrine, if it were not true; what I said was, that our doctrine of intention, so far from having mischievous consequences, as you pretend, appears to me to have only useful and salutary consequences, one of which I mentioned. I should be glad to know what evil consequence can follow from it?

A. I will tell you. This consequence inevitably follows from it: that it is absolutely impossible for you or any other believer in that doctrine to be certain that you have received valid orders, or that any priest or bishop has received valid orders. It is impossible for any Roman Catholic (believing this doctrine) to be certain that he has received, or that anybody else has received, any valid sacrament, inasmuch as he cannot be certain of the secret intention of the minister of that sacrament. For, mark! Your doctrine makes that to be necessary for the essence of a sacrament which, whether it exist or not, cannot, with any certainty, be known. Therefore, you cannot be certain that any given ministration of a sacrament is valid. For instance, you have received the order of the priesthood at the hands of a bishop; it is absolutely impossible to know whether or not that bishop really, in his inmost heart, intended to give you that order; therefore, according to this doctrine, it is impossible for you to know whether or not you are a priest.

R. It is, of course, impossible for me to know the secret intention of another. I cannot read the heart of another; but may I not be certain another way. I am morally certain, from my knowledge of you, that you would not willingly do a dishonest thing. May I not be equally certain, from my knowledge of the bishop's piety and religious character, that he would not be guilty of so gross a profanation of his sacred office.

A. (Smiling). Excuse me, but I cannot avoid smiling, at seeing how curiously extremes meet. This is the express doctrine of our English Puritans, who maintained that the validity of all religious ministrations depends on the sanctity of the ministrant; and this is virtually what you now say, for you derive your certainty of the intention of the minister from his sanctity; therefore, you cannot be certain of the validity of any sacrament ministered by him except so far as you are certain of his sanctity.

R. That is not fair; for your Puritans made the validity of all religious ministrations to depend on the sanctity of the ministrant, whereas I do not such thing. I believe that valid sacraments may be administered even by an unholy ministrant. I only say, in answer to your allegations, that it is not impossible for me, as you assert, to be certain whether I am a priest or not, in consequence of my inability

to discern the secret intention of the bishop who ordained me; and I say that, although I cannot see into his heart, yet I may have moral certainty of the rectitude of his intention in other ways—as, for example, by my knowledge of his character.

A. Well, let us suppose that you have this certainty. Granted that you are certain, by some means or other, of the intention of the bishop who ordained you; this will not make you a whit more certain of the validity of your orders, unless you can also be certain of the intention of the bishop that ordained your ordainer; and then of the intention of the bishop that ordained him, and so on to the last link of the chain. Nor is this all. You must also be certain, if your doctrine of intention be true, that all this long series of bishops were each individual of them validly baptized. For you know it is the doctrine of the canon law,^a as well as of the most eminent Roman theologians, that, if a man be promoted to orders unbaptized, his orders are null. Therefore, if any one bishop in this long series, from the bishop who ordained you to the Apostles, should happen to have been baptized by a priest whose intention in that act of baptism was contrary to the intention of the Church, or to the mind of Christ, that bishop was not baptized; therefore his orders were null; therefore the orders of all ordained by him are null; therefore the orders of all the bishops in the series between him and your ordainer, inclusive, are null; and therefore your orders are null. Now, I say, it is absolutely impossible for you to be certain, that in the long series of bishops, extending over nineteen centuries, not one was baptized by a profligate priest, deacon, or layman (for your Roman divines admit laymen to baptise in cases of necessity) who intended to make void the sacrament, or who did not intend what the Church intends. Such is the monstrous confusion and uncertainty introduced by this school doctrine, enough to undermine the faith of all simple Christians, and to make infidels of those who reflect, if they look upon such a tenet as a part of Christianity.

R. I think I may now retort upon you your accusation of adopting Puritan arguments; for this is, exactly, what your Puritans allege against the doctrine of apostolical succession. You never can be certain (say they) of the validity of your orders, because you cannot be certain that every individual in the long series between your ordainers and the Apostles was validly ordained.

A. This will not bring you off. For this Puritan argument takes no account of the ancient canons by which all consecrations of bishops are regulated, and which secure the succession against all possibility of danger arising from the possible, but very improbable, circumstance of an unconsecrated man acting as a bishop in the consecration of another. *The consecration of a bishop is a public, external act, which must be well known to the bishops in communion with him, as well as to the clergy and laity over whom he presides.* And the absence of such consecration must, therefore, be, in all cases, notorious, and easily ascertained; not so the secret intention of the priest or bishop who ministers a sacrament. The Puritan objection against the apostolical succession is, therefore, founded on ignorance of the doctrine and discipline of the Church. But you cannot say this in reply to my objection. Your doctrine of the necessity of the ministrant's intention is not by me mis-stated or misunderstood. That doctrine asserts that the secret intention of an individual, of which no other individual can be cognizant, is necessary to the validity of all sacraments. In baptism, therefore, no living man, except the minister himself, can be certain that he intends what the Church intends, and that the baptism is valid. In ordination, which you suppose to be a sacrament, the ministering bishop may be conscious of a right intention, but still cannot be certain of the validity of his act, because he cannot be certain of his own baptism, and, therefore, cannot be certain, according to your own principles, whether he has received the sacerdotal and episcopal character himself. Hence, it is perfectly clear that no man, who holds your doctrine of intention, can be certain either that he himself or anybody else has received holy orders in the Church of Rome.

(To be continued).

The following announcement will, we doubt not, be very agreeable to certain of our readers:—

"We have heard and believe that there is a good foundation for the statement, that it is the intention of the Executive to bring the great advantages derivable from the reading of wholesome books specially within the reach of one highly important body in this country—the Irish Constabulary. His Excellency and Sir Duncan McGregor feel, we believe, deep anxiety on this head, so much so, indeed, as to contemplate the establishment of small peripatetic libraries at all the Constabulary stations. In the event of this intention being carried into effect—and we hope it may, for a more deserving class of men, or one more prone to profit by literary reading and culture, is not to be met with in the three kingdoms—we are assured that the boon will be highly acceptable to the Constabulary of Ireland, that it will be an advantage to the country, and tend to increase the respect attached to her Majesty's representatives in Ireland."—*Daily Express*.

^a Decretal, lib. iii., tit. 43, cap. 1.—"Si quis presbyter ordinatus, deprehenderit se non esse baptizatum, baptizetur et iterum ordinetur;" and see also cap. 2, which is entitled, "Non baptizatus ordinari non potest; et si de facto ordinatus, non recipit ordinis characterem, licet crediderit baptizatus." This is the opinion of that eminent theologian Pope Innocent III., whose writings have had so much influence on modern Roman theology; for this chapter is taken from one of his epistles.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

To diminish the chance of disappointment, all letters should be forwarded to the office by the first day of the month.

All letters to be addressed to the Editor, 9, Upper Sackville-street. Contributors of £1 per annum will be furnished with six copies, any of which will be forwarded, as directed, to nominees of the subscriber.

We have received letters from Mr. William Rourke, and several other valued correspondents, but are obliged to postpone them in consequence of the great length of Mr. E. Power's letter.

In consequence of several persons having returned copies of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN, which had been already paid for by friends, under the apprehension that they might be called on hereafter in person to pay for them, we beg to call their attention to the following announcement—viz., that any one receiving any number of this journal which has not been ordered by himself, will not be charged for it, and may assume that it has been paid for by a subscriber.

The Catholic Layman.

DUBLIN, APRIL 17, 1856.

We believe there are no words dearer to the hearts of Irishmen than civil and religious liberty.

In this free country a man might almost as well say he was not a friend to justice, morality, or truth, as admit that he was not an advocate for civil and religious liberty.

Different men, however, seem to entertain very different ideas of what this glorious liberty really consists in.

The Most Rev. Doctor Cullen has more than once informed us that "wherever the (Roman) Catholic religion prevailed, there *true liberty* followed." What precise signification Doctor Cullen attaches to the phrase *true liberty* we find it difficult to ascertain. It may cover a very large or a very narrow margin; it may mean either perfect and absolute freedom, or merely so much of liberty as he and the priests conceive to be wholesome for their people to enjoy.

We suppose we shall best judge of it by observing the kind of liberty which has actually followed in countries where the Roman Catholic religion has extensively and exclusively prevailed, and the element of Protestant heresy been most effectually excluded.

We have, within the last few years, had, unfortunately, too many instances of the sense in which civil and religious liberty is understood in Roman Catholic countries. We have seen it in Tuscany, in Naples, in Italy, and in Spain, the most (Roman) Catholic country in Europe, where even the dead are not suffered to go to their earthly resting-place with the services of their Church unless they believe in the orthodox creed.

In Spain, which was truly more Romanist than Rome itself, we have little to look back upon but a long dreary night of religious despotism and intolerance, practised by a domineering priesthood and a merciless inquisition, which has done its best to stifle every spark of religious liberty, and has gone so far to crush every rising emotion of independence of thought or action, that the nation which occupies one of the fairest provinces, and inherited the proudest traditions and the noblest descent in Europe, has dwindled down to a state so inferior, that its envoys are no longer summoned to the great congresses and councils of Europe, where the fate of nations is being decided upon, and the balance of power adjusted.

Most of our readers know that Spain, under Charles V. and Philip II. (the husband of our Queen Mary, of persecuting memory), was the most powerful kingdom in all Europe, and her armies the most formidable. Shortly after this a gloomy indolence and a degrading superstition settled over the people like a depressing nightmare; religious tyranny and intolerance, and the most cruel persecution, under the Inquisition, spread their arms over the

¹ S. Thom. 3, Summum 9, 64, art. 9.

country, paralyzed its energies, stunted its intellectual and moral growth, and reduced it eventually to the condition in which it is now, fallen from its foremost place and rank in Europe to be the most imbecile and retrogressive of its states." This religious intolerance banished the industrious Jews and confiscated their property. It persecuted the Protestant heretics with still greater cruelty, on account of their religion, and compelled the industrious lowlanders of Holland to revolt and form themselves into an independent kingdom, which soon rivalled and afterwards far surpassed the cruel mother state, in trade and commerce, in naval power and foreign possessions. It also expelled the peaceful and industrious Moors, who contributed largely to the wealth and prosperity of the kingdom. In a former number of our paper (vol. ii., p. 136) we gave an exact and literal copy of the decree of Pope Clement VII., in which he not only absolves the Emperor Charles V. from his coronation oath, binding him not to disturb the Moors, but urges him to expel them or reduce them to slavery, in case they refused to embrace Christianity:—

"In case the Moors do persist in the hardness of their hearts, so as not to embrace the faith of Christ within a term prefixed by the Inquisition, they shall be commanded, upon pain of perpetual servitude and bondage, to depart out of the said kingdom, which, if they do fail to do within the time, they shall be all slaves, and treated as such."^b

Is this what Dr. Cullen means by that "true liberty," which is the consequence of the (Roman) Catholic religion prevailing—i.e., having the upper hand in a country? And what was the result? The unfortunate Moors, who were not to be converted in this summary way, were expatriated to the number of 600,000 from their pleasant homes. The expulsion of the Jews and the persecution and annihilation of all heretics followed; Spain became, *par excellence*, the most Catholic and orthodox of nations. It became the birth-place of St. Dominic and Ignatius Loyola, and the chief seat of the Holy Inquisition. But meanwhile its vast empire in Mexico and Peru faded away; its philosophers, and warriors, and statesmen became extinct, the halls of its once famous universities of Salamanca, Toledo, and Seville became silent and deserted. The glory of the nation was utterly gone, and the royal court of Madrid, in our own day, has become, perhaps, the most profligate and scandalous in all the world.

We recently congratulated ourselves and our readers on observing a bright spot on this dark horizon of religious bigotry and intolerance, which we fondly hoped might betoken the dawn of better things. We noticed the eloquent address of Don Raphael Degollado, a Roman Catholic deputy, in the Cortes or parliament of Spain (see CATHOLIC LAYMAN, October, 1855, vol. iv., p. 115), on making a motion in favour of religious liberty, which was lost only by a majority of four. Perhaps his best argument in favour of toleration was to this effect: "If the gates of hell are not to prevail against the word of God, why this puerile fear that injury could be done by another religion to the religion of Christ? If we have firm faith in the truth of our dogmas, why shut ourselves up in an impenetrable enclosure, and discuss nothing, tolerate nothing, but persecute all outside our pale?" The Roman Catholic deputy in Spain here used language which we doubt not found a cordial response in the hearts and minds of every reader of this paper, which, we trust, has ever been conducted in the true spirit of toleration and religious liberty.

^a We collect from the pages of our respected contemporary, *Revue Chrétienne* of Paris (see No. for January, 1856, p. 61) that M. de Montalembert, one of the most distinguished Roman Catholic writers now living in France, has lately published, in *Le Correspondant*, two articles which have produced the most lively sensation; in one of which he draws a parallel between the progress of events in England and Spain during the last three centuries, in language which is a model of eloquence. We hope, ere long, to recur to this subject again.

^b See 1 vol. of Geddes' Tracts, p. 29.

Don Raphael Degollado was representative of Barcelona, which, after Madrid, is the largest city in Spain, and is, above all others, the most flourishing and industrious. We, therefore, read with very great interest the following account of a transaction occurring in Barcelona, which seemed to savour something of a growing spirit of toleration on the part of the authorities in Spain. It is copied from the *Siècle*:—

"On the morning of the 22nd February, Senor Ruet, a Spaniard, Protestant pastor, was arrested, and conducted to the guard-room in the palace of the Captain-General. In the afternoon Senor Ruet wrote to General Zapatero, and from his letter the following passage is transcribed:—

"During several days past an incensed mob of fanatics, excited by some unknown agency, have gone so far as to menace my life, and have at length succeeded, by calumnies, in depriving me of my liberty. Worked on, as they are, by the spirit of intolerance, I forgive them; but as a Spanish citizen I claim from your sense of justice the protection of the laws of my country. I am ignorant of the crime of which I am accused. Is this persecution directed against my opinions or against my religious belief? I have never disguised them, nor will I ever deny them. No—not even if I be led to the stake. My religion is the religion of Christ—that which Catholic intolerance calls Protestant and heretical. Yes, General, I am a Protestant. The temple of my religious creed is my heart; God alone can read that, and He will be my supreme judge. I demand either to be set once more at liberty or to be brought before a tribunal, where at least I shall know for what cause I am accused, and placed face to face with those who have become my enemies and accusers."

"Having read this letter, the *Siècle* adds, that General Zapatero instantly summoned Senor Ruet to his presence, and, after having heard him with the utmost interest, had him instantly reconducted to his home. To the honour of the Spain of our days, it is but right to say that the press of Barcelona, and, for the most part, that of the capital, Madrid, has taken the side of liberty of conscience, against that of intolerance."^a

This narrative was most assuring and agreeable, as it led us to hope that the liberal spirit of the Captain-General, taken up by the press of Barcelona, and re-echoed by the press of Madrid on the side of liberty of conscience, and against the spirit of intolerance, would find a response in the government of her most Catholic and Orthodox Majesty the Queen of Spain. But, alas! a few days were enough to dispel this pleasing illusion! And to convince us that Catholic Spain is now as blindly intolerant as ever, we transcribe the following sad proof from a Parisian contemporary:—

The presence of a Protestant minister at Barcelona has inspired M. Arias, the Spanish Minister of Justice, to write the following circular, addressed to all the presidents of tribunals in the Peninsula, but which has not appeared in the *Madrid Gazette*:—

"The Queen has lately been informed that attempts have been made in certain points of the Peninsula to teach and propagate doctrines contrary to the very sacred dogmas of our true faith, and to that which the Holy Catholic Apostolic and Roman Church teaches. Her Majesty's government is firmly resolved to exercise the utmost rigour against those Spaniards and foreigners who may pretend, under any pretext whatever, to break or disturb the religious unity to which it has pleased Divine Providence that Spain should owe her prosperity, and upon which repose—it could not be otherwise—the second basis of the constitution by which the monarchy should be guided. In consequence, M. le President, you will arrange with the political, administrative, and ecclesiastical authorities to put a stop, at any price, to such a crime—to such an enormous scandal. You will sedulously excite the zeal of the public prosecutor, who must proceed officially against the guilty parties whenever he may suspect the accomplishment of any act contrary to the basis of the state religion. It is to be thoroughly

^a Senor Ruet is not a Protestant clergyman. He is a young artist, whose love of the arts attracted him to Italy, where he became imbued with evangelical opinions, and subsequently became a member of the Waldensian Church at Turin. Within the last few months he returned to Spain, his native land, where it appears he has with much zeal, and not without success, been labouring to diffuse that truth which he himself has embraced. — *Italian Journal*.

^b We arrive to find from *L'Univers*, of the 7th instant, that the principal paper which took part with Senor Ruet, *L'Eco de la Actualidad*, has since been suppressed. The announcement was made in the Cortes on the 24th of March by the minister, in reply to M. F. Guerau, who complained that the press in Spain was not free. These are his words:—"The Journal just named by the noble member thought proper to discuss in its columns matters of religion; but the law does not permit any publication of this kind, except on the condition of having previously obtained the authority of the bishop. The civil authority of Barcelona, with which the government is highly satisfied, told the editor to conform himself to the provisions of the law; and thereupon the latter thought it convenient to cease his publication." About as convenient as we suppose the editor of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN would, if he were obliged to ask the previous consent of the Most Reverend Paul Cullen to discuss any matter of religion! Thank God, matters are not quite come to that pass yet in Ireland.

understood that as the piety of the Queen will worthily reward the services rendered by the judges in the matter, to those who may be indifferent, or culpably tolerant, will draw upon themselves an exemplary chastisement."

In reading this, one can scarcely be sufficiently astonished at the amazing and shameless audacity of the statement that to her religious unity Spain owes her prosperity! Every man in his senses would interpret this, if not found in a royal decree, as a caustic satire on the religious tyranny of the Spanish government, which has reduced the most fertile and favoured province of Europe from the highest to the lowest rank among nations, and which might more properly be read thus—that to her religious intolerance Spain owes her degradation and ruin! But the document contains a still more flagrant and dangerous, because it is a more practical, affront to the sentiments of modern society in relation to government. The Presidents of the judicial tribunals throughout Spain are expected to arrange with the political and ecclesiastical authorities to put a stop, at any price (we suppose at the price of blood, and torture, and of human agony, and life itself, if necessary), to such a crime (viz.:—the propagation of doctrines contrary to the sacred dogmas of the Roman Church), and the zeal of the state prosecutor (the Spanish Attorney-General) is to be sedulously excited to proceed against the guilty parties whom they may suspect; and, worse than all, the piety of the Queen (the most reputable of women and of Sovereigns) will worthily reward the services of the judges who may be zealous, and will chastise with exemplary chastisement those who may be indifferent or culpably tolerant. In truth, the cruel Judge Jeffreys, sent out on his "bloody assizes," could not have a commission addressed to him in terms more abominable or with the fell instigation to accomplish his judicial murders more vehemently pressed upon him. May we venture to ask is this the kind of "true" liberty which Dr. Cullen says invariably follows where the Roman Catholic religion prevails?

We are sorry to find that Dr. Cullen has allowed another month to pass without taking any further notice of our periodical, or availing himself of the liberal offer which we made him in our February number, to place a considerable portion of our paper at his disposal, for the purpose of proving what he had thought proper to assert of us in a late Pastoral.

No doubt the most reverend delegate Apostolic has his own reasons for adopting the course of publicly asserting what he is unable to prove, and trying to put down a periodical of which he has perhaps some reason to be afraid, by the summary process of an authority which he may possibly find ere long to be an overstrained one.

We were at first disposed to think our case a hard one; but a little further experience of the kind of "civil and religious liberty" which Dr. Cullen is disposed to allow, even to Roman Catholic newspapers wholly devoted to his own creed and party, has helped materially to reconcile us to it. If it be true that

"Friends in distress
Make sorrows the less,"

much consolation has, indeed, been provided for us, and a cordial balm to heal our wounded feelings, in seeing the most "orthodox" of journals placed conspicuously in the Index Prohibitorius of the Most Rev. Dr. Cullen, alongside with the CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

We scarcely, indeed, expected to see the day when the Apostolic delegate, imported from Rome (that seat of all civil and religious liberty!), should expel the *Telegraph*, *Nation*, and *Tablet* newspapers from the reading-rooms of the Catholic Young Men's Society, in the city of Dublin.

The three most orthodox (in the Roman Catholic sense) journals in the kingdom are all con-